



Exception Report	187	Version	1	Owner	BearingPoint
Issued	February 18, 2003	Test	PMR1	Role	Test Manager
Applicability	Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Wisconsin				

Certain SBC Ameritech technical documentation does not adequately document the calculation logic applied to reporting data used in the calculation of certain SBC Ameritech published performance measurement results.

Issue

SBC Ameritech provided BearingPoint with Performance Metrics Business Technical Requirements (BTR) documentation, which provides the systems used, the data required, and the step-by-step logic used to arrive at the published performance measurement results.

Exhibit 1 lists by measure group and performance measurements those SBC Ameritech technical documents that appear incomplete or inaccurate. Inaccuracies may include database queries that incorrectly document the extraction of data and calculation of performance results.

Exhibit 1 – Inaccurate Documentation by Measure Group and Performance Measurement

Measure Group	Performance Measurement
Billing	14 and 18
Collocation	MI 4
Directory Assistance and Operator Services	83
Directory Assistance Database	110, 111, 112, and 113
Facilities Modification	CW 1, CW 6, CW 7, CW 8, CW 9, and WI 9
Interconnection Trunks	71
Local Number Portability	91, 92, 93, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, and 101
Maintenance & Repair	54
Ordering	5, 5.2, 6, 7, 7.1, 8, 9, 10.1, 10.2, 10.3, 10.4, 11, 11.1, 11.2, 13, 13.1, and MI 2
Other	CW 5, MI 9, MI 12, MI 13, and MI 15
Poles, Conduits & Rights of Way	105 and 106
Pre-Order	1.1 and 4
Provisioning	55.1, 56, and 56.1

This exception report is for discussion purposes only and is subject to change without notice.

For the performance measurements included in Exhibit 1, SBC Ameritech has indicated that it will provide updated technical documentation (BTRs) through the ongoing Documentation Content Review process.

Exhibit 2 lists by measure group and performance measurements where BearingPoint has been able to validate that SBC Ameritech's technical documentation (BTRs) is accurate.

Exhibit 2 – Accurate Documentation by Measure Group and Performance Measurement

Measure Group	Performance Measurement
911	102, 103, 104, MI 6, MI 7, and MI 8
Billing	16, 19, and 20
Bonafide Requests	120 and 121
Coordinated Conversions	114, 114.1, 115, 115.1, 115.2, and MI 3
Directory Assistance and Operator Services	79 and 81
Interconnection Trunks	70 and 70.1
Miscellaneous Administrative	24.1 and 25
Other	MI 14

For the performance measurements that are not included in Exhibit 1 or 2, BearingPoint is still evaluating the accuracy of the updated technical documentation.

Assessment

Accurate documentation for calculating performance measurement results is necessary to maintain consistency in the calculation process and to enable effective management of changes to the calculations over time.



Exception Report	188	Version	1	Owner	BearingPoint
Issued	February 18, 2003	Test	PMR1	Role	Test Manager
Applicability	Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Wisconsin				

Certain SBC Ameritech technical documentation does not consistently present an adequate depiction of the flow of data from the source systems to the performance measurement reporting systems for certain performance measurements.

Issue

SBC Ameritech has provided BearingPoint with two types of technical documentation, Data Flow Diagrams and Data Element Maps:

- *Data Flow Diagrams (DFDs)* document the flow of data from the Performance Measurement Reporting System to the source system.
- *Data Element Maps (DEMs)* document the flow of data from the Performance Measurement Reporting System to the source system at the field level.

Exhibit 1 lists by measure group and performance measurements where SBC Ameritech's flow documentation (DEMs and DFDs) appear inaccurate. Examples of inaccuracies found in the documentation include the absence of certain intermediate systems and unclear sources of data elements.

Exhibit 1 – Inaccurate Documentation by Measure Group and Performance Measurement

Measure Group	Performance Measurement
911	104.1 and MI 6
Bonafide Requests	120 and 121
Billing	14 and 19
Coordinated Conversions	115.2
Directory Assistance Database	111 and 113
Facilities Modification	CW 1, CW 6, CW 7, CW 8, and CW 9
Interconnection Trunks	71
Local Number Portability	91, 92, 93, 95, and 99
Miscellaneous Administrative	25
Order	5, 5.2, 6, 7, 7.1, 8, 9, 10, 10.1, 10.2, 10.3, 10.4, 11, 11.1, 11.2, 13, 13.1, and MI 2
Other	MI 9 and MI 13
Pre-Order	4

This exception report is for discussion purposes only and is subject to change without notice.

For the performance measurements included in Exhibit 1, SBC Ameritech has indicated that it will provide updated technical documentation (DEMs and DFDs) through the ongoing Documentation Content Review process.

Exhibit 2 lists by measure group and performance measurements where BearingPoint has been able to validate that SBC Ameritech's technical documentation is accurate.

Exhibit 2 –Accurate Documentation by Measure Group and Performance Measurement

Measure Group	Performance Measurement
911	102, 103, and 104
Billing	16, 18 and 20
Collocation	107, 108, 109, and MI 4
Directory Assistance Database	112
Directory Assistance & Operator Services	79, 80, 81, 82, and 83
Interconnection Trunks	70.1, 70.2, and 77
Miscellaneous Administrative	21.1, 22 and 24.1
NXX	117, 118, and 119
Other	CW 4, IN 1, MI 12 and MI 15
Poles, Conduits & Rights of Way	105, 106, and MI 5
Pre-Order	1.1 and 1.2

For the performance measurements that are not included in Exhibit 1 or 2, BearingPoint is still in the process of validating the accuracy of the updated technical documentation.

Assessment

Accurate documentation, which describes the flow of performance measurement data through SBC Ameritech's systems, is necessary to maintain consistency in the results calculation process and to enable effective management of changes to the data flows.

Attachment 10 to Rebuttal Affidavit of Timothy M. Connolly

Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported

Pre-Ordering/Ordering

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
1.1	Obs.	532	6/17/2002	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measurements 1.1 ("Average Response Time for Manual Loop Make-up Information") do not follow the January, February or March 2002 published metrics business rules.
1.1	Obs.	726	12/3/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 1.1 ("Average Response Time for Manual Loop Make-up Information") for July, August and September 2002.
<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
1.2	Obs.	667	9/26/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate SBC Ameritech's January 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 1.2 ("Accuracy of Actual Loop Makeup Information Provided for DSL Orders").
1.2	Obs.	697	11/14/2002	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measurement 1.2 ("Accuracy of Actual Loop Makeup Information Provided for DSL Orders") do not follow the July, August or September 2002 published metrics business rules.
1.2	Obs.	708	11/27/2002	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measurement 1.2 ("Accuracy of Actual Loop Makeup Information Provided for DSL Orders") do not follow the July, August or September 2002 published metrics business rules.
<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
2	Exc.	113	5/21/2002	Ameritech's calculation of Performance Measure 2 ("Percent Responses Received within 'X' Seconds – OSS Interfaces") for January - March 2002 does not follow the approved metrics business rules.
2	Obs.	247	3/11/2002	Ameritech's posted results for certain performance measurements do not follow the published metrics business rules with regard to the reporting of results by state vs. reporting by company.
2	Obs.	569	7/15/2002	SBC Ameritech is not posting the results for Performance Measurement 2 ("Percent Responses Received in 'X' Seconds") in accordance with the January 2002 published metrics business rules.

Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported

2	Obs.	587	7/31/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement (PM) 2 (“Percent Responses Received Within ‘X’ Seconds – OSS interfaces”).
2	Obs.	621	8/22/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate SBC Ameritech’s January 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 2 (“Percent Responses Received Within ‘X’ Seconds”).
2	Obs.	649	9/19/2002	SBC Ameritech’s results for Performance Measurement 2 (“Percent Responses Received Within ‘X’ Seconds – OSS Interfaces”) are not posted correctly for January, February or March 2002.
2	Obs.	811	2/27/2003	SBC Ameritech’s posted results for Performance Measurement 2 (“Percent Responses Received within "X" seconds -- OSS Interfaces”) do not follow the July, August or September 2002 published metrics business rules.
2	Obs.	812	2/27/2003	BearingPoint has been unable to replicate SBC Ameritech’s July 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 2 (“Percent Responses Received Within ‘X’ Seconds”).

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
4	Obs.	247	3/11/2002	Ameritech’s posted results for certain performance measurements do not follow the published metrics business rules with regard to the reporting of results by state vs. reporting by company.
4	Obs.	660	9/23/2002	SBC Ameritech’s posted results for Performance Measurement 4 (“OSS Interface Availability”) do not follow the January, February or March 2002 published metrics business rules.
4	Obs.	668	9/26/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to begin to attempt replication of SBC Ameritech’s January 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 4 (“OSS Interface Availability”).

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
5	Obs.	678	10/9/2002	SBC Ameritech’s results for Performance Measurement 5 (“Percent Firm Order Confirmations (FOCs) Returned Within "X" Hours”) are not posted correctly for January, February or March 2002.
5	Obs.	787	1/16/2003	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of 6 performance measures for July, August and September 2002.

Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
6	Obs.	715	12/3/2002	SBC Ameritech's results for Performance Measurement 6 ("Average Time to Return FOC") are not posted correctly for July, August or September 2002.
6	Obs.	787	1/16/2003	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of 6 performance measures for July, August and September 2002.
<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
7	Obs.	429	5/2/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate Ameritech's October 2001 reported results for PM 7 ("Percent Mechanized Completions Returned Within One Hour of Completion in Ordering Systems").
7	Obs.	659	9/23/2002	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measurements 7 ("Percent Mechanized Completions Returned Within One Hour of Completion in Ordering Systems"), 7.1 ("Percent Mechanized Completions Returned Within One Day Of Work Completion"), and 8 ("Average Time to Return Mechanized Completions") do not follow the January, February or March 2002 published metrics business rules.
7	Obs.	787	1/16/2003	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of 6 performance measures for July, August and September 2002.
<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
7.1	Obs.	297	4/3/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate Ameritech's reported results for Performance Measurement 7.1 ("Percent Mechanized Completions Returned Within One Day of Work Completion") for October 2001.
7.1	Obs.	430	5/2/2002	Ameritech's calculation of Performance Measure 7.1 ("Percent Mechanized Completions Returned Within One Day of Work Completion") does not follow the published metrics business rules.
7.1	Obs.	493	6/3/2002	Ameritech's calculation of Performance Measure 7.1 ("Percent Mechanized Completions Returned Within One Day of Work Completion") does not follow the January, February or March 2002 published Metrics Business Rules.

Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported

7.1	Obs.	659	9/23/2002	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measurements 7 ("Percent Mechanized Completions Returned Within One Hour of Completion in Ordering Systems"), 7.1 ("Percent Mechanized Completions Returned Within One Day Of Work Completion"), and 8 ("Average Time to Return Mechanized Completions") do not follow the January, February or March 2002 published metrics business rules.
7.1	Obs.	743	12/12/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 7.1 ("Percent Mechanized Completions Returned Within One Day Of Work Completion") for the July and August 2002 data months.

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
9	Obs.	571	7/15/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 9 ("Percent Rejects") for January, February and March 2002.
9	Obs.	576	7/18/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate SBC Ameritech's January 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 9 ("Percent Rejects").
9	Obs.	688	10/23/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 9 (Percentage Rejects") for January, February and March 2002.
9	Obs.	727	12/3/2002	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measurements 9, ("Percent Rejects"), 10.1 ("Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within One Hour of Receipt of Reject in System (Auto/Auto)"), 10.2 ("Percentage Manual Rejects Received Electronically and Returned Within 5 Hours"), 10.3 ("Percent Manual Rejects Received Manually and Returned Within 5 Hours"), 11.1 ("Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received Electronically via EDI"), 11.2 ("Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received thru Manual Process"), and 95 ("Average Response Time for Non-Mechanized Rejects Returned With Complete and Accurate Codes") do not follow the July, August or September 2002 published metrics business rules.

Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
10	Obs.	162	11/28/2001	Ameritech does not follow its published metrics business rules when calculating the performance measures: PM 10 (% Mechanized Rejects Returned Within 1 Hour of Receipt of Reject in MOR) PM 10.1 (Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned within One Hour of Receipt of Order) PM 10.2 (Percent Manual Rejects Received Electronically and Returned Within Five Hours) PM 10.3 (Percent Manual Rejects Received Manually and Returned Within Five Hours) PM 11 (Mean Time to Return Mechanized Rejects) PM 11.1 (Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received via an Electronic Interface) PM 11.2 (Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received thru the Manual Process)
10	Obs.	217	2/11/2002	KPMG Consulting cannot replicate Ameritech's April 2001 reported results for PM 10 ("Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned within 1 Hour of Receipt of Reject in MOR").
10	Obs.	545	6/24/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate SBC Ameritech's January 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 10 ("Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within One Hour of Receipt of Reject in MOR") due to an error in SBC Ameritech's programming logic.
10	Obs.	585	7/29/2002	SBC Ameritech's results for Performance Measurement Michigan 10 ("Percent Time-out Transactions") are not posted correctly for January, February or March 2002.
10	Obs.	586	7/29/2002	SBC Ameritech's results for Performance Measurements Michigan 10 ("Percent Time-out Transactions") and Michigan 16 ("Percentage Rejected Query Notices") are not posted correctly for January, February or March 2002.
10	Obs.	756	12/17/2002	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measurements 10 ("Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within One Hour of Receipt of Reject in the System"), 10.4 ("Percentage of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices"), 11 ("Mean Time to Return Mechanized Rejects"), and 91 ("Percentage of LNP Only Due Dates within Industry Guidelines") do not follow the July, August or September 2002 published metrics business rules.
10	Obs.	803	2/13/2003	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 10 ("Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within One Hour of Receipt of Reject in System"), and Performance Measurement 11 ("Mean Time to Return Mechanized Rejects") for July, August and September 2002.

Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
10.1	Obs.	162	11/28/2001	Ameritech does not follow its published metrics business rules when calculating the performance measures: PM 10 (% Mechanized Rejects Returned Within 1 Hour of Receipt of Reject in MOR) PM 10.1 (Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned within One Hour of Receipt of Order) PM 10.2 (Percent Manual Rejects Received Electronically and Returned Within Five Hours) PM 10.3 (Percent Manual Rejects Received Manually and Returned Within Five Hours) PM 11 (Mean Time to Return Mechanized Rejects) PM 11.1 (Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received via an Electronic Interface) PM 11.2 (Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received thru the Manual Process)
10.1	Obs.	727	12/3/2002	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measurements 9, ("Percent Rejects"), 10.1 ("Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within One Hour of Receipt of Reject in System (Auto/Auto)"), 10.2 ("Percentage Manual Rejects Received Electronically and Returned Within 5 Hours"), 10.3 ("Percent Manual Rejects Received Manually and Returned Within 5 Hours"), 11.1 ("Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received Electronically via EDI"), 11.2 ("Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received thru Manual Process"), and 95 ("Average Response Time for Non-Mechanized Rejects Returned With Complete and Accurate Codes") do not follow the July, August or September 2002 published metrics business rules.
10.1	Obs.	755	12/17/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 10.1 ("Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within 1 Hour of Receipt of Order"), 10.2 ("Percent Manual Rejects Received Electronically and Returned Within 5 Hours"), 10.3 ("Percent Manual Rejects Received Manually and Returned Within 5 Hours"), 11.1 ("Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received via an Electronic Interface"), 11.2 ("Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received Thru the Manual Process") and 95 ("Average Response Time for Non-Mechanized Rejects Returned With Complete and Accurate Codes") for July, August and September 2002.

Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
10.2	Obs.	162	11/28/2001	Ameritech does not follow its published metrics business rules when calculating the performance measures: PM 10 (% Mechanized Rejects Returned Within 1 Hour of Receipt of Reject in MOR) PM 10.1 (Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned within One Hour of Receipt of Order) PM 10.2 (Percent Manual Rejects Received Electronically and Returned Within Five Hours) PM 10.3 (Percent Manual Rejects Received Manually and Returned Within Five Hours) PM 11 (Mean Time to Return Mechanized Rejects) PM 11.1 (Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received via an Electronic Interface) PM 11.2 (Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received thru the Manual Process)
10.2	Obs.	727	12/3/2002	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measurements 9, ("Percent Rejects"), 10.1 ("Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within One Hour of Receipt of Reject in System (Auto/Auto)"), 10.2 ("Percentage Manual Rejects Received Electronically and Returned Within 5 Hours"), 10.3 ("Percent Manual Rejects Received Manually and Returned Within 5 Hours"), 11.1 ("Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received Electronically via EDI"), 11.2 ("Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received thru Manual Process"), and 95 ("Average Response Time for Non-Mechanized Rejects Returned With Complete and Accurate Codes") do not follow the July, August or September 2002 published metrics business rules.
10.2	Obs.	755	12/17/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 10.1 ("Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within 1 Hour of Receipt of Order"), 10.2 ("Percent Manual Rejects Received Electronically and Returned Within 5 Hours"), 10.3 ("Percent Manual Rejects Received Manually and Returned Within 5 Hours"), 11.1 ("Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received via an Electronic Interface"), 11.2 ("Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received Thru the Manual Process") and 95 ("Average Response Time for Non-Mechanized Rejects Returned With Complete and Accurate Codes") for July, August and September 2002.

Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
10.3	Obs.	162	11/28/2001	Ameritech does not follow its published metrics business rules when calculating the performance measures: PM 10 (% Mechanized Rejects Returned Within 1 Hour of Receipt of Reject in MOR) PM 10.1 (Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned within One Hour of Receipt of Order) PM 10.2 (Percent Manual Rejects Received Electronically and Returned Within Five Hours) PM 10.3 (Percent Manual Rejects Received Manually and Returned Within Five Hours) PM 11 (Mean Time to Return Mechanized Rejects) PM 11.1 (Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received via an Electronic Interface) PM 11.2 (Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received thru the Manual Process)
10.3	Obs.	727	12/3/2002	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measurements 9, ("Percent Rejects"), 10.1 ("Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within One Hour of Receipt of Reject in System (Auto/Auto)"), 10.2 ("Percentage Manual Rejects Received Electronically and Returned Within 5 Hours"), 10.3 ("Percent Manual Rejects Received Manually and Returned Within 5 Hours"), 11.1 ("Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received Electronically via EDI"), 11.2 ("Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received thru Manual Process"), and 95 ("Average Response Time for Non-Mechanized Rejects Returned With Complete and Accurate Codes") do not follow the July, August or September 2002 published metrics business rules.
10.3	Obs.	755	12/17/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 10.1 ("Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within 1 Hour of Receipt of Order"), 10.2 ("Percent Manual Rejects Received Electronically and Returned Within 5 Hours"), 10.3 ("Percent Manual Rejects Received Manually and Returned Within 5 Hours"), 11.1 ("Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received via an Electronic Interface"), 11.2 ("Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received Thru the Manual Process") and 95 ("Average Response Time for Non-Mechanized Rejects Returned With Complete and Accurate Codes") for July, August and September 2002.
<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
10.4	Obs.	534	6/17/2002	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measurements 10.4 ("Percentage of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices") and MI 2 ("Percentage of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices Within 24 Hours of the Due Date") do not follow the January and February 2002 published metrics business rules.

Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported

10.4	Obs.	583	7/24/2002	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measurement Performance Measurements 10.4 ("Percentage of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices") and MI 2 ("Percentage of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices Within 24 Hours of the Due Date") do not follow the January, February, and March 2002 published metrics business rules.
10.4	Obs.	676	10/9/2002	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measurement 10.4 ("Percentage of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices") and MI 2 ("Percentage of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices Within 24 Hours of the Due Date") do not follow the January, February or March 2002 published metrics business rules.
10.4	Obs.	684	10/23/2002	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measurements 10.4 ("Percentage of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices") and Michigan 2 ("Percentage of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices within 24 Hours of the Due Date") do not follow the January, February or March 2002 published metrics business rules.
10.4	Obs.	687	10/23/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 10.4 ("Percentage of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices") for January, February and March 2002.
10.4	Obs.	725	12/3/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements 10.4 ("Percentage of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices") and MI 2 ("Percentage of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices Within 24 Hours of the Due Date") for July, August and September 2002.
10.4	Obs.	756	12/17/2002	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measurements 10 ("Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within One Hour of Receipt of Reject in the System"), 10.4 ("Percentage of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices"), 11 ("Mean Time to Return Mechanized Rejects"), and 91 ("Percentage of LNP Only Due Dates within Industry Guidelines") do not follow the July, August or September 2002 published metrics business rules.

Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
11	Obs.	162	11/28/2001	Ameritech does not follow its published metrics business rules when calculating the performance measures: PM 10 (% Mechanized Rejects Returned Within 1 Hour of Receipt of Reject in MOR) PM 10.1 (Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned within One Hour of Receipt of Order) PM 10.2 (Percent Manual Rejects Received Electronically and Returned Within Five Hours) PM 10.3 (Percent Manual Rejects Received Manually and Returned Within Five Hours) PM 11 (Mean Time to Return Mechanized Rejects) PM 11.1 (Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received via an Electronic Interface) PM 11.2 (Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received thru the Manual Process)
11	Obs.	632	8/27/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate SBC Ameritech's January 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 11 ("Mean Time to Return Mechanized Rejects").
11	Obs.	693	10/30/2002	BearingPoint has been unable to replicate SBC Ameritech's January 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 11 ("Mean Time to Return Mechanized Rejects").
11	Obs.	756	12/17/2002	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measurements 10 ("Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within One Hour of Receipt of Reject in the System"), 10.4 ("Percentage of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices"), 11 ("Mean Time to Return Mechanized Rejects"), and 91 ("Percentage of LNP Only Due Dates within Industry Guidelines") do not follow the July, August or September 2002 published metrics business rules.
11	Obs.	803	2/13/2003	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 10 ("Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within One Hour of Receipt of Reject in System"), and Performance Measurement 11 ("Mean Time to Return Mechanized Rejects") for July, August and September 2002.
<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
11.1	Obs.	162	11/28/2001	Ameritech does not follow its published metrics business rules when calculating the performance measures: PM 10 (% Mechanized Rejects Returned Within 1 Hour of Receipt of Reject in MOR) PM 10.1 (Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned within One Hour of Receipt of Order) PM 10.2 (Percent Manual Rejects Received Electronically and Returned Within Five Hours) PM 10.3 (Percent Manual Rejects Received Manually and Returned Within Five Hours) PM 11 (Mean Time to Return Mechanized Rejects) PM 11.1 (Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received via an Electronic Interface) PM 11.2 (Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received thru the Manual Process)

Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported

11.1	Obs.	727	12/3/2002	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measurements 9, ("Percent Rejects"), 10.1 ("Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within One Hour of Receipt of Reject in System (Auto/Auto)"), 10.2 ("Percentage Manual Rejects Received Electronically and Returned Within 5 Hours"), 10.3 ("Percent Manual Rejects Received Manually and Returned Within 5 Hours"), 11.1 ("Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received Electronically via EDI"), 11.2 ("Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received thru Manual Process"), and 95 ("Average Response Time for Non-Mechanized Rejects Returned With Complete and Accurate Codes") do not follow the July, August or September 2002 published metrics business rules.
11.1	Obs.	755	12/17/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 10.1 ("Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within 1 Hour of Receipt of Order"), 10.2 ("Percent Manual Rejects Received Electronically and Returned Within 5 Hours"), 10.3 ("Percent Manual Rejects Received Manually and Returned Within 5 Hours"), 11.1 ("Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received via an Electronic Interface"), 11.2 ("Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received Thru the Manual Process") and 95 ("Average Response Time for Non-Mechanized Rejects Returned With Complete and Accurate Codes") for July, August and September 2002.

PM Number Issue Issue Description

11.2	Obs.	162	11/28/2001	Ameritech does not follow its published metrics business rules when calculating the performance measures: PM 10 (% Mechanized Rejects Returned Within 1 Hour of Receipt of Reject in MOR) PM 10.1 (Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned within One Hour of Receipt of Order) PM 10.2 (Percent Manual Rejects Received Electronically and Returned Within Five Hours) PM 10.3 (Percent Manual Rejects Received Manually and Returned Within Five Hours) PM 11 (Mean Time to Return Mechanized Rejects) PM 11.1 (Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received via an Electronic Interface) PM 11.2 (Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received thru the Manual Process)
11.2	Obs.	727	12/3/2002	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measurements 9, ("Percent Rejects"), 10.1 ("Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within One Hour of Receipt of Reject in System (Auto/Auto)"), 10.2 ("Percentage Manual Rejects Received Electronically and Returned Within 5 Hours"), 10.3 ("Percent Manual Rejects Received Manually and Returned Within 5 Hours"), 11.1 ("Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received Electronically via EDI"), 11.2 ("Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received thru Manual Process"), and 95 ("Average Response Time for Non-Mechanized Rejects Returned With Complete and Accurate Codes") do not follow the July, August or September 2002 published metrics

Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported

business rules.

11.2	Obs.	755	12/17/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 10.1 (“Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within 1 Hour of Receipt of Order”), 10.2 (“Percent Manual Rejects Received Electronically and Returned Within 5 Hours”), 10.3 (“Percent Manual Rejects Received Manually and Returned Within 5 Hours”), 11.1 (“Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received via an Electronic Interface”), 11.2 (“Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received Thru the Manual Process”) and 95 (“Average Response Time for Non-Mechanized Rejects Returned With Complete and Accurate Codes”) for July, August and September 2002.
------	------	-----	------------	---

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
13	Obs.	317	4/8/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate Ameritech’s October 2001 reported results for Performance Measurement 13 (“Order Process Percent Flow Through”).
13	Obs.	488	6/3/2002	Ameritech’s calculations of Performance Measurement 13 (“Order Process Percent Flow Through”) and Performance Measurement 13.1 (“Total Order Process Percent Flow Through”) do not follow the published metrics business rules.
13	Obs.	746	12/12/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 13 (“Order Process Percent Flow Through”) for the July, August and September 2002 data months.

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
13.1	Obs.	299	4/3/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate Ameritech’s October 2001 reported results for Performance Measurement PM13.1 (“Total Order Process Percent Flow Through”).
13.1	Obs.	488	6/3/2002	Ameritech’s calculations of Performance Measurement 13 (“Order Process Percent Flow Through”) and Performance Measurement 13.1 (“Total Order Process Percent Flow Through”) do not follow the published metrics business rules.
13.1	Obs.	661	9/23/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements 13.1(Total Order Process Percent Flow Through), 91(Percentage of LNP Only Due Dates within Industry Guidelines), 99 (“Average Delay Days for Ameritech Missed Due Dates”), MI9 (Percentage Missing FOCs), and MI13 (Percent Loss Notification Within One Hour of Service Order Completion) for January, February and March 2002.

Attachment 10 to Rebuttal Affidavit of Timothy M. Connolly

Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported

13.1	Obs.	787	1/16/2003	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of 6 performance measures for July, August and September 2002.
------	------	-----	-----------	---

Billing

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
------------------	--	----------------------	---------------------	---------------------------------

17	Obs.	524	6/13/2002	SBC Ameritech's calculation of Performance Measure 17 ("Billing Completeness") for January 2002 does not follow the Metrics Business Rules.
----	------	-----	-----------	---

17	Obs.	731	12/3/2002	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measure 17 ("Billing Completeness") do not follow the July, August or September 2002 published metrics business rules.
----	------	-----	-----------	---

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
------------------	--	----------------------	---------------------	---------------------------------

19	Obs.	218	2/11/2002	Ameritech did not follow the metrics business rules in its calculation of Performance Measure 19 ("Daily Usage Feed Timeliness") for the month of October.
----	------	-----	-----------	--

19	Obs.	247	3/11/2002	Ameritech's posted results for certain performance measurements do not follow the published metrics business rules with regard to the reporting of results by state vs. reporting by company.
----	------	-----	-----------	---

19	Obs.	359	4/15/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate Ameritech's restated October 2001 results for Performance Measurement 19 ("Daily Usage Feed Timeliness").
----	------	-----	-----------	--

19	Obs.	694	10/30/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 19 ("Daily Usage Feed Timeliness") for January 2002.
----	------	-----	------------	--

Miscellaneous Administrative

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
------------------	--	----------------------	---------------------	---------------------------------

22	Obs.	247	3/11/2002	Ameritech's posted results for certain performance measurements do not follow the published metrics business rules with regard to the reporting of results by state vs. reporting by company.
----	------	-----	-----------	---

22	Obs.	370	4/18/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate Ameritech's October 2001 reported results for Performance Measurement 22 ("Local Service Center (LSC) Grade of Service (GOS)").
----	------	-----	-----------	--

22	Obs.	548	6/24/2002	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measurement 22 ("Local Service Center (LSC) Grade of Service (GOS)") do not follow the January, February or March 2002 published metrics business rules.
----	------	-----	-----------	---

Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported

22	Obs.	549	6/24/2002	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measurement 22 ("Local Service Center (LSC) Grade of Service (GOS)") do not follow the January, February or March 2002 published metrics business rules.
22	Obs.	577	7/18/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate SBC Ameritech's January 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 22 ("Local Service Center (LSC) Grade of Service (GOS)").
22	Obs.	630	8/27/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements 21.1 (Average time on Hold at LSC) and 22 (Local Service Center Grade of Service) for January.

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
24.1	Obs.	296	4/3/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate Ameritech's October 2001 reported results for Performance Measurement 24.1 ("Average Time Placed on Hold at LOC (seconds)").
24.1	Obs.	590	8/6/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 24.1 ("Average Time Placed on Hold at Local Operations Center (LOC)") for January 2002.

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
25	Obs.	247	3/11/2002	Ameritech's posted results for certain performance measurements do not follow the published metrics business rules with regard to the reporting of results by state vs. reporting by company.
25	Obs.	295	4/3/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate Ameritech's October 2001 reported results for Performance Measurement 25 ("Local Operations Center (LOC) Grade of Service (GOS)").
25	Obs.	427	5/2/2002	Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measurement 25 ("Local Operations Center (LOC) Grade of Service (GOS)") do not follow the published metrics business rules.
25	Obs.	566	7/11/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate SBC Ameritech's January 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 25 ("Local Operations Center (LOC) Grade of Service (GOS)").

Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported

Provisioning - Resale POTS

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
27	Obs.	339	4/9/2001	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate Ameritech's October 2001 reported results for Performance Measurement 27 ("Mean Installation Interval").
27	Obs.	467	5/15/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate Ameritech's January 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 27 ("Mean Installation Interval").
27	Obs.	748	12/12/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of the retail analogs for all of the RRS Provisioning and Maintenance & Repair POTS UNE-P Performance Measurements for the July, August and September 2002 data months.
27	Obs.	814	3/5/2003	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Provisioning and Maintenance and Repair POTS performance measurements do not follow the July, August or September 2002 published metrics business rules for UNE-P.

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
28	Obs.	340	4/9/2001	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate Ameritech's October 2001 reported results for Performance Measurement 28 ("Percent POTS/UNE P Installations Completed Within the Customer Requested Due Date").
28	Obs.	459	5/9/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate Ameritech's January 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 28 ("Percent Installations Completed Within the Customer Due Date").
28	Obs.	739	12/10/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 28 ("Percent POTS/UNE-P Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date") for the July, August and September 2002 data months.
28	Obs.	748	12/12/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of the retail analogs for all of the RRS Provisioning and Maintenance & Repair POTS UNE-P Performance Measurements for the July, August and September 2002 data months.
28	Obs.	814	3/5/2003	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Provisioning and Maintenance and Repair POTS performance measurements do not follow the July, August or September 2002 published metrics business rules for UNE-P.

Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
29	Obs.	341	4/9/2001	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate Ameritech's reported October 2001 results for Performance Measurement 29 ("Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates – Resale POTS").
29	Obs.	625	8/27/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate SBC Ameritech's January 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 29 ("Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates").
29	Obs.	628	8/27/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 29 ("Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates") for January 2002.
29	Obs.	748	12/12/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of the retail analogs for all of the RRS Provisioning and Maintenance & Repair POTS UNE-P Performance Measurements for the July, August and September 2002 data months.
29	Obs.	814	3/5/2003	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Provisioning and Maintenance and Repair POTS performance measurements do not follow the July, August or September 2002 published metrics business rules for UNE-P.
<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
30	Obs.	441	5/6/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate Ameritech's January 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 30 ("Percent Ameritech Missed Due Dates Due to Lack of Facilities").
30	Obs.	748	12/12/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of the retail analogs for all of the RRS Provisioning and Maintenance & Repair POTS UNE-P Performance Measurements for the July, August and September 2002 data months.
30	Obs.	814	3/5/2003	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Provisioning and Maintenance and Repair POTS performance measurements do not follow the July, August or September 2002 published metrics business rules for UNE-P.
<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
31	Obs.	433	5/2/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate Ameritech's January 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 31 ("Average Delay Days For Missed Due Dates Due to Lack of Facilities").

Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported

31	Obs.	748	12/12/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of the retail analogs for all of the RRS Provisioning and Maintenance & Repair POTS UNE-P Performance Measurements for the July, August and September 2002 data months.
----	------	-----	------------	--

31	Obs.	814	3/5/2003	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Provisioning and Maintenance and Repair POTS performance measurements do not follow the July, August or September 2002 published metrics business rules for UNE-P.
----	------	-----	----------	---

<i>PM</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
------------------	----------------------	---------------------	---------------------------------

32	Obs.	748	12/12/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of the retail analogs for all of the RRS Provisioning and Maintenance & Repair POTS UNE-P Performance Measurements for the July, August and September 2002 data months.
----	------	-----	------------	--

32	Obs.	814	3/5/2003	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Provisioning and Maintenance and Repair POTS performance measurements do not follow the July, August or September 2002 published metrics business rules for UNE-P.
----	------	-----	----------	---

<i>PM</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
------------------	----------------------	---------------------	---------------------------------

33	Obs.	748	12/12/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of the retail analogs for all of the RRS Provisioning and Maintenance & Repair POTS UNE-P Performance Measurements for the July, August and September 2002 data months.
----	------	-----	------------	--

33	Obs.	814	3/5/2003	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Provisioning and Maintenance and Repair POTS performance measurements do not follow the July, August or September 2002 published metrics business rules for UNE-P.
----	------	-----	----------	---

<i>PM</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
------------------	----------------------	---------------------	---------------------------------

35	Obs.	748	12/12/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of the retail analogs for all of the RRS Provisioning and Maintenance & Repair POTS UNE-P Performance Measurements for the July, August and September 2002 data months.
----	------	-----	------------	--

Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported

35	Obs.	754	12/12/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements 35 (“Percent Trouble Reports Within 30 Days (I-30) of Installation”), 37 (“Trouble Report Rate”), 37.1 (“Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports”), 38 (“Percent Missed Repair Commitments”), 39 (“Receipt To Clear Duration”), 40 (“Percent Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours”), 41 (“Percent Repeat Reports”), and 42 (“Percent No Access (Percent of Trouble Reports with No Access)”) for the July, August and September 2002 data months.
35	Obs.	762	12/17/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of 16 Maintenance and Repair performance measurements for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.
35	Obs.	814	3/5/2003	SBC Ameritech’s posted results for Provisioning and Maintenance and Repair POTS performance measurements do not follow the July, August or September 2002 published metrics business rules for UNE-P.

Maintenance - Resale POTS

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
37	Obs.	627	8/27/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate SBC Ameritech’s January 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 37 (“Trouble Report Rate”).
37	Obs.	748	12/12/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of the retail analogs for all of the RRS Provisioning and Maintenance & Repair POTS UNE-P Performance Measurements for the July, August and September 2002 data months.
37	Obs.	754	12/12/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements 35 (“Percent Trouble Reports Within 30 Days (I-30) of Installation”), 37 (“Trouble Report Rate”), 37.1 (“Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports”), 38 (“Percent Missed Repair Commitments”), 39 (“Receipt To Clear Duration”), 40 (“Percent Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours”), 41 (“Percent Repeat Reports”), and 42 (“Percent No Access (Percent of Trouble Reports with No Access)”) for the July, August and September 2002 data months.
37	Obs.	762	12/17/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of 16 Maintenance and Repair performance measurements for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.
37	Obs.	814	3/5/2003	SBC Ameritech’s posted results for Provisioning and Maintenance and Repair POTS performance measurements do not follow the July, August or September 2002 published metrics business rules for UNE-P.

Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
37.1	Obs.	639	9/6/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate SBC Ameritech's January 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 37.1 ("Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports").
37.1	Obs.	748	12/12/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of the retail analogs for all of the RRS Provisioning and Maintenance & Repair POTS UNE-P Performance Measurements for the July, August and September 2002 data months.
37.1	Obs.	754	12/12/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements 35 ("Percent Trouble Reports Within 30 Days (I-30) of Installation"), 37 ("Trouble Report Rate"), 37.1 ("Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports"), 38 ("Percent Missed Repair Commitments"), 39 ("Receipt To Clear Duration"), 40 ("Percent Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours"), 41("Percent Repeat Reports"), and 42 ("Percent No Access (Percent of Trouble Reports with No Access)") for the July, August and September 2002 data months.
37.1	Obs.	762	12/17/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of 16 Maintenance and Repair performance measurements for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.
37.1	Obs.	814	3/5/2003	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Provisioning and Maintenance and Repair POTS performance measurements do not follow the July, August or September 2002 published metrics business rules for UNE-P.
<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
38	Obs.	748	12/12/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of the retail analogs for all of the RRS Provisioning and Maintenance & Repair POTS UNE-P Performance Measurements for the July, August and September 2002 data months.
38	Obs.	753	12/12/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements 53 ("Percent Repeat Reports") and 54 ("Failure Frequency") for the July, August and September 2002 data months.
38	Obs.	762	12/17/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of 16 Maintenance and Repair performance measurements for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.
38	Obs.	814	3/5/2003	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Provisioning and Maintenance and Repair POTS

Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported

performance measurements do not follow the July, August or September 2002 published metrics business rules for UNE-P.

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
39	Obs.	748	12/12/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of the retail analogs for all of the RRS Provisioning and Maintenance & Repair POTS UNE-P Performance Measurements for the July, August and September 2002 data months.
39	Obs.	754	12/12/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements 35 (“Percent Trouble Reports Within 30 Days (I-30) of Installation”), 37 (“Trouble Report Rate”), 37.1 (“Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports”), 38 (“Percent Missed Repair Commitments”), 39 (“Receipt To Clear Duration”), 40 (“Percent Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours”), 41 (“Percent Repeat Reports”), and 42 (“Percent No Access (Percent of Trouble Reports with No Access)”) for the July, August and September 2002 data months.
39	Obs.	762	12/17/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of 16 Maintenance and Repair performance measurements for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.
39	Obs.	814	3/5/2003	SBC Ameritech’s posted results for Provisioning and Maintenance and Repair POTS performance measurements do not follow the July, August or September 2002 published metrics business rules for UNE-P.
<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
40	Obs.	164	11/28/2001	Ameritech’s calculation of Performance Measurement 40 (“Percent Out of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours”) is inconsistent with the published metrics business rules.
40	Obs.	165	11/28/2001	Ameritech does not calculate Performance Measurement 40 (“Percent Out of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours”) consistently with the published metrics business rule.
40	Obs.	721	12/3/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 40 (“Percent Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours”) for the July, August and September 2002 data months.
40	Obs.	748	12/12/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of the retail analogs for all of the RRS Provisioning and Maintenance & Repair POTS UNE-P Performance Measurements for the July, August and September 2002 data months.

Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported

40	Obs.	754	12/12/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements 35 (“Percent Trouble Reports Within 30 Days (I-30) of Installation”), 37 (“Trouble Report Rate”), 37.1 (“Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports”), 38 (“Percent Missed Repair Commitments”), 39 (“Receipt To Clear Duration”), 40 (“Percent Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours”), 41 (“Percent Repeat Reports”), and 42 (“Percent No Access (Percent of Trouble Reports with No Access)”) for the July, August and September 2002 data months.
40	Obs.	762	12/17/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of 16 Maintenance and Repair performance measurements for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.
<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
41	Obs.	300	4/3/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate Ameritech’s October 2001 reported results for Performance Measurement 41 (“Percent Repeat Report”).
41	Obs.	748	12/12/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of the retail analogs for all of the RRS Provisioning and Maintenance & Repair POTS UNE-P Performance Measurements for the July, August and September 2002 data months.
41	Obs.	754	12/12/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements 35 (“Percent Trouble Reports Within 30 Days (I-30) of Installation”), 37 (“Trouble Report Rate”), 37.1 (“Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports”), 38 (“Percent Missed Repair Commitments”), 39 (“Receipt To Clear Duration”), 40 (“Percent Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours”), 41 (“Percent Repeat Reports”), and 42 (“Percent No Access (Percent of Trouble Reports with No Access)”) for the July, August and September 2002 data months.
41	Obs.	762	12/17/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of 16 Maintenance and Repair performance measurements for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.
41	Obs.	814	3/5/2003	SBC Ameritech’s posted results for Provisioning and Maintenance and Repair POTS performance measurements do not follow the July, August or September 2002 published metrics business rules for UNE-P.

Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
42	Obs.	748	12/12/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of the retail analogs for all of the RRS Provisioning and Maintenance & Repair POTS UNE-P Performance Measurements for the July, August and September 2002 data months.
42	Obs.	754	12/12/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements 35 (“Percent Trouble Reports Within 30 Days (I-30) of Installation”), 37 (“Trouble Report Rate”), 37.1 (“Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports”), 38 (“Percent Missed Repair Commitments”), 39 (“Receipt To Clear Duration”), 40 (“Percent Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours”), 41 (“Percent Repeat Reports”), and 42 (“Percent No Access (Percent of Trouble Reports with No Access)”) for the July, August and September 2002 data months.
42	Obs.	762	12/17/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of 16 Maintenance and Repair performance measurements for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.
42	Obs.	814	3/5/2003	SBC Ameritech’s posted results for Provisioning and Maintenance and Repair POTS performance measurements do not follow the July, August or September 2002 published metrics business rules for UNE-P.

Provisioning

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
43	Obs.	288	3/28/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate Ameritech’s reported results for Performance Measurement 43 (“Average Installation Interval”) for October 2001.
43	Obs.	453	5/9/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate Ameritech’s January 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 43 (“Average Installation Interval”).
43	Obs.	525	6/13/2002	SBC Ameritech’s posted results for Performance Measurement 43 (“Average Installation Interval”) and Performance Measurement 45 (“Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates”) do not follow the January, February or March 2002 published Metrics Business Rules.
43	Obs.	761	12/17/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements 43 (“Average Installation Interval”) and 44 (“Percent Specials Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date”) for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.

Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
44	Obs.	282	3/27/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate Ameritech's reported results for Performance Measurement 44 ("Percent Specials Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date") for October 2001.
44	Obs.	761	12/17/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements 43 ("Average Installation Interval") and 44 ("Percent Specials Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date") for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.
<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
45	Obs.	342	4/9/2001	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate Ameritech's reported October 2001 results for Performance Measure 45 ("Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates – Resale Specials and UNE Loop and Port Combinations").
45	Obs.	525	6/13/2002	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measurement 43 ("Average Installation Interval") and Performance Measurement 45 ("Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates") do not follow the January, February or March 2002 published Metrics Business Rules.
45	Obs.	633	8/27/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate SBC Ameritech's January 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 45 ("Percent Ameritech Missed Due Dates").
45	Obs.	711	11/27/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements 45 and 58 ("Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates") for July, August and September 2002.
<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
46	Obs.	759	12/17/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements 46 ("Percent Trouble Reports Within 30 Days (I-30) of Installation"), Performance Measurement 52 ("Mean Time To Restore"), and 59 ("Percent Trouble Reports Within 30 Days (I-30) of Installation") for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.
46	Obs.	760	12/17/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of 8 performance measurements for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.

Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported

46	Obs.	762	12/17/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of 16 Maintenance and Repair performance measurements for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.
----	------	-----	------------	--

<i>PM</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
------------------	----------------------	---------------------	---------------------------------

47	Obs.	281	3/27/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate Ameritech's reported results for Performance Measurement 47 ("Percent Ameritech Missed Due Dates Due To Lack of Facilities") for October 2001.
----	------	-----	-----------	---

47	Obs.	760	12/17/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of 8 performance measurements for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.
----	------	-----	------------	--

<i>PM</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
------------------	----------------------	---------------------	---------------------------------

49	Obs.	277	3/27/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate Ameritech's reported results for Performance Measurement 49 ("Average Delay Days for Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates") for October 2001.
----	------	-----	-----------	---

49	Obs.	760	12/17/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of 8 performance measurements for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.
----	------	-----	------------	--

<i>PM</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
------------------	----------------------	---------------------	---------------------------------

50	Obs.	308	4/4/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate Ameritech's October 2001 reported results for Performance Measurement 50 ("Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates >30 Days").
----	------	-----	----------	---

50	Obs.	470	5/15/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate Ameritech's January 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 50 ("Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates >30 days").
----	------	-----	-----------	---

50	Obs.	760	12/17/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of 8 performance measurements for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.
----	------	-----	------------	--

Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported

Maintenance – Resale Specials & UNE Loop and Port

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
52	Obs.	759	12/17/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements 46 (“Percent Trouble Reports Within 30 Days (I-30) of Installation”), Performance Measurement 52 (“Mean Time To Restore”), and 59 (“Percent Trouble Reports Within 30 Days (I-30) of Installation”) for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.
52	Obs.	760	12/17/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of 8 performance measurements for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.
52	Obs.	763	12/17/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 52 (“Mean Time To Restore”) for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.
<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
53	Obs.	754	12/12/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements 53 (“Percent Repeat Reports”) and 54 (“Failure Frequency”) for the July, August and September 2002 data months.
53	Obs.	762	12/17/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of 16 Maintenance and Repair performance measurements for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.
<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
54	Obs.	644	9/11/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate SBC Ameritech’s January 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 54 (“Failure Frequency”).
54	Obs.	752	12/12/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements 54 (“Failure Frequency”), 54.1 (“Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports”), 65.1 (“Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports”), 67 (“Mean Time to Restore”) and 69 (“Percent Repeat Reports”) for the July, August and September 2002 data months.
54	Obs.	753	12/12/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements 53 (“Percent Repeat Reports”) and 54 (“Failure Frequency”) for the July, August and September 2002 data months.

Attachment 10 to Rebuttal Affidavit of Timothy M. Connolly

<i>Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported</i>				
54	Obs.	760	12/17/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of 8 performance measurements for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.
54	Obs.	762	12/17/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of 16 Maintenance and Repair performance measurements for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.
54	Obs.	799	1/30/2003	BearingPoint has been unable to replicate SBC Ameritech's July 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 54 ("Failure Frequency").
<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
54.1	Obs.	555	7/1/2002	SBC Ameritech is not posting the results for Performance Measurement 54.1 ("Trouble Report Rate net of Installation and repeat Reports") in accordance with the January, February, and March 2002 published metrics business rules.
54.1	Obs.	664	9/23/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate SBC Ameritech's January 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 54.1 ("Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation & Repeat Report").
54.1	Obs.	752	12/12/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements 54 ("Failure Frequency"), 54.1 ("Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports"), 65.1 ("Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports"), 67 ("Mean Time to Restore") and 69 ("Percent Repeat Reports") for the July, August and September 2002 data months.
54.1	Obs.	762	12/17/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of 16 Maintenance and Repair performance measurements for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.
<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
55	Obs.	120	10/23/2001	Ameritech's calculation of Performance Measures 55 ("Average Installation Interval"), 55.2 ("Average Installation Interval for Loop With LNP"), and 56 ("Percent Installations Completed Within "X" Days") for April 2001 does not follow the defined metrics business rules.
55	Obs.	393	4/24/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate Ameritech's October 2001 reported results for Performance Measurement 55 ("Average Installation Interval").
55	Obs.	598	8/8/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate SBC Ameritech's January 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 55 ("Average Installation Interval").

Attachment 10 to Rebuttal Affidavit of Timothy M. Connolly

Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported				
55	Obs.	750	12/12/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 55 “Average Installation Interval”) for the July, August and September 2002 data months.
55	Obs.	751	12/12/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 55 “Average Installation Interval”) for the July, August and September 2002 data months.
55	Obs.	760	12/17/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of 8 performance measurements for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.
PM		Number	Issue	Issue Description
55.1	Obs.	561	7/11/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate SBC Ameritech’s January 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 55.1 (“Average Installation Interval - DSL”).
55.1	Obs.	745	12/12/2002	SBC Ameritech’s posted results for Performance Measurement 55.1 (“Average Installation Interval - DSL”) do not follow the July, August or September 2002 published metrics business rules.
55.1	Obs.	776	12/31/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 55.1 “Average Installation Interval - DSL”) for the July 2002 data month.
PM		Number	Issue	Issue Description
55.2	Obs.	120	10/23/2001	Ameritech’s calculation of Performance Measures 55 (“Average Installation Interval”), 55.2 (“Average Installation Interval for Loop With LNP”), and 56 (“Percent Installations Completed Within “X” Days”) for April 2001 does not follow the defined metrics business rules.
55.2	Obs.	717	12/3/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 55.2 (“Average Installation Interval for Loop with LNP”) for the July, August and September 2002 data months.
55.2	Obs.	749	12/12/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 55.2 (“Average Installation Interval for Loop with LNP”) and Performance Measurement 56.1 (“Percent Installations Completed Within the Customer Requested Due Date for Loop with LNP”) for the July, August and September 2002 data months.

Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
55.3	Obs.	335	4/8/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate Ameritech's October 2001 reported results for Performance Measurement 55.3 ("Percent xDSL – Capable Loop Orders Requiring the Removal of Load Coils and/or Repeaters").
55.3	Obs.	491	6/3/2002	Ameritech's posted January 2002 results for Performance Measurement 55.3 ("Percent xDSL-Capable Loop Orders Requiring the Removal of Load Coils and or Repeaters") do not follow the published metrics business rules for this measure.
55.3	Obs.	810	2/17/2003	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measurement 55.3 ("Percent xDSL - Capable Loop Orders Requiring the Removal of Load Coils and/or Repeaters") do not follow the July 2002 published metrics business rules as the TOTAL_LOOP_LENGTH field required to calculate this performance measurement is not populated.
<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
56	Obs.	120	10/23/2001	Ameritech's calculation of Performance Measures 55 ("Average Installation Interval"), 55.2 ("Average Installation Interval for Loop With LNP"), and 56 ("Percent Installations Completed Within "X" Days") for April 2001 does not follow the defined metrics business rules.
56	Obs.	428	5/2/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate Ameritech's October 2001 reported results for Performance Measurement 56 ("Percent Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date").
56	Obs.	729	12/3/2002	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measurement 56 ("Percent Installations Completed within Customer Requested Due Date") and Performance Measurement 56.1 ("Percent Installations Completed within Customer Requested Due Date for Loop with LNP") do not follow the July, August or September 2002 published metrics business rules.
56	Obs.	730	12/3/2002	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measurement 56 ("Percent Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date") do not follow the July, August or September 2002 published metrics business rules.
56	Obs.	768	12/20/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 56 ("Percent Installations Completed within Customer Requested Due Date") for July, August, and September 2002.

Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
56.1	Obs.	456	5/9/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate Ameritech's January 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 56.1 ("Percent Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date for Loop With LNP").
56.1	Obs.	729	12/3/2002	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measurement 56 ("Percent Installations Completed within Customer Requested Due Date") and Performance Measurement 56.1 ("Percent Installations Completed within Customer Requested Due Date for Loop with LNP") do not follow the July, August or September 2002 published metrics business rules.
56.1	Obs.	749	12/12/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 55.2 ("Average Installation Interval for Loop with LNP") and Performance Measurement 56.1 ("Percent Installations Completed Within the Customer Requested Due Date for Loop with LNP") for the July, August and September 2002 data months.
<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
58	Obs.	613	8/21/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate SBC Ameritech's January 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 58 ("Percent Ameritech Missed Due Dates").
58	Obs.	711	11/27/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements 45 and 58 ("Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates") for July, August and September 2002.
<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
59	Obs.	298	4/3/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate Ameritech's October 2001 reported results for Performance Measurement 59 ("Percent Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Installation").
59	Obs.	511	6/10/2002	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measurement 59 ("Percent Trouble Reports Within 30 Days (I-30) of Installation") do not follow the defined business requirements for performance measurement calculation for January 2002.
59	Obs.	626	8/27/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate SBC Ameritech's January 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 59 ("Percent Trouble Reports Within 30 Days (I-30) of Installation").
59	Obs.	728	12/3/2002	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measurement 59 ("Percent Trouble Reports with 30 Days (I-30) of Installation") do not follow the July 2002 published metrics business

Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported
rules.

59	Obs.	759	12/17/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements 46 (“Percent Trouble Reports Within 30 Days (I-30) of Installation”), Performance Measurement 52 (“Mean Time To Restore”), and 59 (“Percent Trouble Reports Within 30 Days (I-30) of Installation”) for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.
----	------	-----	------------	--

Maintenance – Unbundled Network Elements

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
65.1	Obs.	744	12/12/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 65.1 (“Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports”) for the July, August and September 2002 data months.
65.1	Obs.	752	12/12/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements 54 (“Failure Frequency”), 54.1 (“Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports”), 65.1 (“Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports”), 67 (“Mean Time to Restore”) and 69 (“Percent Repeat Reports”) for the July, August and September 2002 data months.
65.1	Obs.	758	12/17/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of 5 Maintenance and Repair performance measurements for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
66	Obs.	606	8/14/2002	SBC Ameritech’s posted results for Performance Measurements 66 (“Percent Missed Repair Commitments”) and 68 (“Percent Out Of Service (OOS) < “24” Hours”) do not follow the January, February or March 2002 published metrics business rules.
66	Obs.	716	12/3/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements 66 (“Percent Missed Repair Commitments”) and 68 (“Percent Out Of Service (OOS) < “24” Hours”) in the July, August and September 2002 data months.
66	Obs.	758	12/17/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of 5 Maintenance and Repair performance measurements for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.
66	Obs.	762	12/17/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of 16 Maintenance and Repair performance measurements for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.

Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
67	Obs.	685	10/23/2002	BearingPoint has been unable to replicate SBC Ameritech's January 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 67 ("Mean Time To Restore").
67	Obs.	752	12/12/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements 54 ("Failure Frequency"), 54.1 ("Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports"), 65.1 ("Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports"), 67 ("Mean Time to Restore") and 69 ("Percent Repeat Reports") for the July, August and September 2002 data months.
67	Obs.	758	12/17/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of 5 Maintenance and Repair performance measurements for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.
67	Obs.	762	12/17/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of 16 Maintenance and Repair performance measurements for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
68	Obs.	369	4/18/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate Ameritech's January 2002 reported results for
68	Obs.	557	7/1/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 68 ("Percent Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours") for January 2002.
68	Obs.	716	12/3/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements 66 ("Percent Missed Repair Commitments") and 68 ("Percent Out Of Service (OOS) < "24" Hours") in the July, August and September 2002 data months.
68	Obs.	762	12/17/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of 16 Maintenance and Repair performance measurements for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
69	Obs.	640	9/6/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate SBC Ameritech's January 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 69 ("Percent Repeat Reports").
69	Obs.	752	12/12/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements 54 ("Failure Frequency"), 54.1 ("Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports"), 65.1 ("Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports"), 67 ("Mean Time to Restore") and 69 ("Percent Repeat Reports") for the July, August and September 2002 data months.

Attachment 10 to Rebuttal Affidavit of Timothy M. Connolly

Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported

69	Obs.	758	12/17/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of 5 Maintenance and Repair performance measurements for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.
69	Obs.	762	12/17/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of 16 Maintenance and Repair performance measurements for the July, August, and September 2002 data months.

Interconnection Trunks

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
70	Obs.	125	10/25/2001	Ameritech's calculation of Performance Measure 70 ("Percentage of Trunk Blockage - Call Blockage") and 70.1 ("Trunk Blockage Exclusions") does not follow the metrics business rules.
70	Obs.	136	11/8/2001	KPMG Consulting is unable to replicate the April 2001 results for Performance Measures 70 (Percentage of Trunk Blockage - Call Blockage) and 70.1 (Trunk Blockage Exclusions) as reported by Ameritech in its performance measurement results.
70	Obs.	435	5/2/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate Ameritech's January and February 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 70 ("Percentage of Trunk Blockage (Call Blockage)").
70	Obs.	454	5/9/2002	The current state of Ameritech's published reports renders it impossible for KPMG Consulting to replicate Ameritech's reported results for Performance Measurement 70 ("Percentage of Trunk Blockage (Call Blockage)").
70	Obs.	736	12/10/2002	BearingPoint has been unable to replicate SBC Ameritech's July 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 70 ("Percentage of Trunk Blockage (Call Blockage)").
<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
70.1	Obs.	125	10/25/2001	Ameritech's calculation of Performance Measure 70 ("Percentage of Trunk Blockage - Call Blockage") and 70.1 ("Trunk Blockage Exclusions") does not follow the metrics business rules.
70.1	Obs.	136	11/8/2001	KPMG Consulting is unable to replicate the April 2001 results for Performance Measures 70 (Percentage of Trunk Blockage - Call Blockage) and 70.1 (Trunk Blockage Exclusions) as reported by Ameritech in its performance measurement results.
70.1	Obs.	436	5/2/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate Ameritech's January 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 70.1 ("Trunk Blockage Exclusions").

Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
70.2	Obs.	343	4/9/2001	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate Ameritech's October 2001 reported results for Performance Measurement 70.2 ("Percentage of Trunk Blockage (Trunk Groups)").
70.2	Obs.	354	4/11/2002	Ameritech's calculation of Performance Measure 70.2 ("Percentage of Trunk Blockage (Trunk Groups)") does not follow the metrics business rules.
<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
73	Obs.	468	5/15/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate Ameritech's January 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 73 ("Percentage Missed Due Dates – Interconnection Trunks").
73	Obs.	508	6/10/2002	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measurements 73 ("Percentage Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date – Interconnection Trunks"), 74 ("Average Delay Days For Missed Due Dates – Interconnection Trunks") and 75 ("Percentage Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates > 30 Days – Interconnection Trunks") do not follow the defined business requirements for performance measurement calculation.
73	Obs.	817	3/6/2003	BearingPoint has been unable to replicate SBC Ameritech's August and September 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 73 ("Percentage Missed Due Dates – Interconnection Trunks").
<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
75	Obs.	303	4/4/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate Ameritech's October 2001 reported results for Performance Measurement 74 ("Average Delay Days For Missed Due Dates – Interconnection Trunks").
75	Obs.	333	4/8/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate Ameritech's October 2001 reported results for Performance Measurement 75 ("Percentage Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates > 30 Days – Interconnection Trunks").
75	Obs.	508	6/10/2002	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measurements 73 ("Percentage Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date – Interconnection Trunks"), 74 ("Average Delay Days For Missed Due Dates – Interconnection Trunks") and 75 ("Percentage Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates > 30 Days – Interconnection Trunks") do not follow the defined business requirements for performance measurement calculation.
75	Obs.	565	7/11/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate SBC Ameritech's January 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 75 ("Percentage Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates > 30 Days – Interconnection Trunks").

Attachment 10 to Rebuttal Affidavit of Timothy M. Connolly

Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported

75	Obs.	720	12/3/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 74 (“Average Delay Days For Missed Due Dates - Interconnection Trunks”), Performance Measurement 75 (“Percentage Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates > 30 Days - Interconnection Trunks”) and Performance Measurement 78 (“Average Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval”) for the July, August and September 2002 data months.
----	------	-----	-----------	---

75	Obs.	804	2/13/2003	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 75 (“Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates> 30 Days –Interconnection Trunks”) for July, August and September 2002.
----	------	-----	-----------	--

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
------------------	--	----------------------	---------------------	---------------------------------

78	Obs.	334	4/8/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate Ameritech’s October 2001 reported results for Performance Measurement 78 (“Average Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval”).
----	------	-----	----------	--

78	Obs.	614	8/21/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate SBC Ameritech’s January 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 78 (“Average Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval”).
----	------	-----	-----------	--

78	Obs.	719	12/3/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 78 (“Average Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval”) for the July, August and September 2002 data months.
----	------	-----	-----------	---

78	Obs.	720	12/3/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 74 (“Average Delay Days For Missed Due Dates - Interconnection Trunks”), Performance Measurement 75 (“Percentage Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates > 30 Days - Interconnection Trunks”) and Performance Measurement 78 (“Average Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval”) for the July, August and September 2002 data months.
----	------	-----	-----------	---

Directory Assistance (DA) and Operator Services (OS)

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
------------------	--	----------------------	---------------------	---------------------------------

79	Obs.	492	6/3/2002	Ameritech is not consistent in the posting of the January to March 2002 denominators for the Directory Assistance and Operator Services performance measurements: 79 (“Directory Assistance Grade of Service”); 80 (“Directory Assistance Average Speed of Answer”); 81 (“Operator Services Grade of Service”); and, 82 (“Operator Services Average Speed of Answer”).
----	------	-----	----------	--

79	Obs.	714	12/3/2002	SBC Ameritech’s results for Performance Measurements 79 (“Percentage of Directory Assistance Calls Answered Within “x” Seconds”) and 81 (“Percentage of Operator Services
----	------	-----	-----------	---

Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported

Calls Answered Within “x” Seconds”) are not posted correctly for July, August or September 2002.

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
81	Obs.	492	6/3/2002	Ameritech is not consistent in the posting of the January to March 2002 denominators for the Directory Assistance and Operator Services performance measurements: 79 (“Directory Assistance Grade of Service”); 80 (“Directory Assistance Average Speed of Answer”); 81 (“Operator Services Grade of Service”); and, 82 (“Operator Services Average Speed of Answer”).
81	Obs.	714	12/3/2002	SBC Ameritech’s results for Performance Measurements 79 (“Percentage of Directory Assistance Calls Answered Within “x” Seconds”) and 81 (“Percentage of Operator Services Calls Answered Within “x” Seconds”) are not posted correctly for July, August or September 2002.

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
82	Obs.	301	4/3/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate Ameritech’s October 2001 reported results for Performance Measurement 82 (“Operator Services Speed of Answer”).
82	Obs.	492	6/3/2002	Ameritech is not consistent in the posting of the January to March 2002 denominators for the Directory Assistance and Operator Services performance measurements: 79 (“Directory Assistance Grade of Service”); 80 (“Directory Assistance Average Speed of Answer”); 81 (“Operator Services Grade of Service”); and, 82 (“Operator Services Average Speed of Answer”).

Local Number Portability (LNP)

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
91	Obs.	437	5/2/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate Ameritech’s January 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 91 (“Percentage of LNP Only Due Dates within Industry Guidelines”).
91	Obs.	523	6/13/2002	SBC Ameritech’s posted results for Performance Measurements 91 (“Percentage of LNP Only Due Dates within Industry Guidelines”) do not follow January, February, or March 2002 published Metrics Business Rules.

Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported

91	Obs.	661	9/23/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements 13.1(Total Order Process Percent Flow Through), 91(Percentage of LNP Only Due Dates within Industry Guidelines), 99 (“Average Delay Days for Ameritech Missed Due Dates”), MI9 (Percentage Missing FOCs), and MI13 (Percent Loss Notification Within One Hour of Service Order Completion) for January, February and March 2002.
91	Obs.	662	9/23/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements 91 (“Percentage of LNP Only Due Dates within Industry Guidelines”) for January, February and March 2002.
91	Obs.	732	12/3/2002	SBC Ameritech’s posted results for Performance Measurements 91 (“Percentage of LNP Only Due Dates within Industry Guidelines”) do not follow the July and August 2002 published metrics business rules.
91	Obs.	756	12/17/2002	SBC Ameritech’s posted results for Performance Measurements 10 (“Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within One Hour of Receipt of Reject in the System”), 10.4 (“Percentage of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices”), 11 (“Mean Time to Return Mechanized Rejects”), and 91 (“Percentage of LNP Only Due Dates within Industry Guidelines”) do not follow the July, August or September 2002 published metrics business rules.
<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
93	Obs.	426	5/2/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate Ameritech’s January 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 93 (“Percentage of Customer Account Restructured Prior to LNP Due Date”).
93	Obs.	742	12/12/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measure 93 (“Percentage of Customer Accounts Restructured by the LNP Due Date”) for the July, August and September 2002 data months.

Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
95	Obs.	727	12/3/2002	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measurements 9, ("Percent Rejects"), 10.1 ("Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within One Hour of Receipt of Reject in System (Auto/Auto)"), 10.2 ("Percentage Manual Rejects Received Electronically and Returned Within 5 Hours"), 10.3 ("Percent Manual Rejects Received Manually and Returned Within 5 Hours"), 11.1 ("Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received Electronically via EDI"), 11.2 ("Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received thru Manual Process"), and 95 ("Average Response Time for Non-Mechanized Rejects Returned With Complete and Accurate Codes") do not follow the July, August or September 2002 published metrics business rules.
95	Obs.	755	12/17/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 10.1 ("Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within 1 Hour of Receipt of Order"), 10.2 ("Percent Manual Rejects Received Electronically and Returned Within 5 Hours"), 10.3 ("Percent Manual Rejects Received Manually and Returned Within 5 Hours"), 11.1 ("Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received via an Electronic Interface"), 11.2 ("Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received Thru the Manual Process") and 95 ("Average Response Time for Non-Mechanized Rejects Returned With Complete and Accurate Codes") for July, August and September 2002.
<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
96	Obs.	329	4/8/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate Ameritech's October 2001 reported results for Performance Measurement 96 ("Percentage Pre-mature Disconnects for LNP Orders").
96	Obs.	710	11/27/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements 96, ("Percentage of Pre-mature Disconnects for LNP Orders"), 97 ("Percentage of Time Ameritech Applies the 10-Digit Trigger Prior to the LNP Order Due Date") and 98 ("Percentage Trouble LNP (I-Reports) in 30 Days of Installation") for July, August and September 2002.
96	Obs.	805	2/13/2003	BearingPoint has been unable to replicate SBC Ameritech's July 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 96 ("Percentage Pre-mature Disconnects for LNP Orders").

Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
97	Obs.	710	11/27/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements 96, (“Percentage of Pre-mature Disconnects for LNP Orders”), 97 (“Percentage of Time Ameritech Applies the 10-Digit Trigger Prior to the LNP Order Due Date”) and 98 (“Percentage Trouble LNP (I-Reports) in 30 Days of Installation”) for July, August and September 2002.
97	Obs.	806	2/13/2003	BearingPoint has been unable to replicate SBC Ameritech’s July 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 97 (“Percentage of Time SBC Ameritech Applies the 10-digit Trigger Prior to the LNP Order Due Date”).
<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
98	Obs.	547	6/24/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate SBC Ameritech’s January 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 98 (“Percentage Trouble LNP (I-Reports) in 30 Days of Installation”).
98	Obs.	710	11/27/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements 96, (“Percentage of Pre-mature Disconnects for LNP Orders”), 97 (“Percentage of Time Ameritech Applies the 10-Digit Trigger Prior to the LNP Order Due Date”) and 98 (“Percentage Trouble LNP (I-Reports) in 30 Days of Installation”) for July, August and September 2002.
<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
99	Obs.	510	6/10/2002	SBC Ameritech’s posted results for Performance Measurement 99 (“Average Delay Days for Ameritech Missed Due Dates (For Stand-Alone LNP Orders)”) does not follow the January, February or March 2002 published metrics business rules.
99	Obs.	661	9/23/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements 13.1(Total Order Process Percent Flow Through), 91(Percentage of LNP Only Due Dates within Industry Guidelines), 99 (“Average Delay Days for Ameritech Missed Due Dates”), MI9 (Percentage Missing FOCs), and MI13 (Percent Loss Notification Within One Hour of Service Order Completion) for January, February and March 2002.
99	Obs.	679	10/10/2002	BearingPoint has been unable to replicate SBC Ameritech’s January 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 99 (“Average Delay Days for Ameritech Missed Due Dates”).

Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
100	Obs.	490	6/3/2002	Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measurements 100 ("Average Time of Out of Service for LNP Conversions") and 101 ("Percent Out of Service < 60 Minutes") do not follow the January, February or March 2002 published metrics business rules.
100	Obs.	747	12/12/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements 100 ("Average Time of Out of Service for LNP Conversions") and 101 ("Percentage Out of Service < 60 minutes") for the July, August and September 2002 data months.

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
101	Obs.	490	6/3/2002	Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measurements 100 ("Average Time of Out of Service for LNP Conversions") and 101 ("Percent Out of Service < 60 Minutes") do not follow the January, February or March 2002 published metrics business rules.
101	Obs.	622	8/22/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate SBC Ameritech's January 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 101 ("Percent Out of Service <60 Minutes").
101	Obs.	747	12/12/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements 100 ("Average Time of Out of Service for LNP Conversions") and 101 ("Percentage Out of Service < 60 minutes") for the July, August and September 2002 data months.

911

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
MI 6	Obs.	663	9/23/2002	SBC Ameritech's results for Performance Measurement Michigan 6 ("Average Time to Return FOC") are not posted correctly for January, February or March 2002.

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
104.1	Obs.	580	7/22/2002	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measurement 104.1 ("The Average Time It Takes To Unlock the 911 Record") do not follow the January, February or March 2002 published metrics business rules.
104.1	Obs.	629	8/27/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 104.1 ("The Average Time it Takes To Unlock the 911 Record") for January, February and March 2002.

Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported

104.1	Obs.	724	12/3/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 104.1 ("The Average Time it Takes To Unlock the 911 Record") for July, August and September 2002.
104.1	Obs.	818	3/6/2003	BearingPoint has been unable to replicate SBC Ameritech's July, August, and September 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 104.1 ("The Average Time It Takes to Unlock the 911 Record").

Poles, Conduit and Rights of Way

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
105	Obs.	623	8/22/2002	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measurement 105 ("Percentage of Requests Processed Within 35 Days") and Performance Measurement 106 ("Average Days Required to Process a Request") do not follow the January, February or March 2002 published metrics business rules.
105	Obs.	796	1/30/2003	BearingPoint has been unable to replicate SBC Ameritech's August 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 105 ("Percentage of Requests Processed Within 35 Days") and Performance Measurement 106 ("Average Days Required to Process a Request").
105	Obs.	798	1/30/2003	BearingPoint has been unable to replicate SBC Ameritech's September 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 105 ("Percentage of Requests Processed Within 35 Days") and Performance Measurement 106 ("Average Days Required to Process a Request").
<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
106	Obs.	623	8/22/2002	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measurement 105 ("Percentage of Requests Processed Within 35 Days") and Performance Measurement 106 ("Average Days Required to Process a Request") do not follow the January, February or March 2002 published metrics business rules.
106	Obs.	796	1/30/2003	BearingPoint has been unable to replicate SBC Ameritech's August 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 105 ("Percentage of Requests Processed Within 35 Days") and Performance Measurement 106 ("Average Days Required to Process a Request").
106	Obs.	798	1/30/2003	BearingPoint has been unable to replicate SBC Ameritech's September 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 105 ("Percentage of Requests Processed Within 35 Days") and Performance Measurement 106 ("Average Days Required to Process a Request").

Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported

Collocation

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
109	Obs.	442	5/6/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate Ameritech's January 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 109 ("Percent of Requests Processed Within the Established Timelines").
109	Obs.	460	5/9/2002	Ameritech is not calculating Performance Measurement 109 ("Percent of Requests Processed Within the Established Timelines") consistently with the published metrics business rules.
109	Obs.	723	12/3/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 109 ("Percent of Requests Processed Within the Established Timelines") for July, August and September 2002.

Directory Assistance Database

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
110	Obs.	689	10/23/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements 110 ("Percentage of Updates Completed into the DA Database within 72 Hours for Facility Based CLECs") and 111 ("Average Update Interval for DA Database for Facility Based CLECs") for January, February and March 2002.
110	Obs.	780	1/14/2003	BearingPoint has been unable to replicate SBC Ameritech's July 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 110 ("Percentage of Updates Completed into the DA Database within 72 Hours for Facility Based CLECs") and 111 ("Average Update Interval for DA Database for Facility Based CLECs").
110	Obs.	785	1/16/2003	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measurements 110 ("Percentage of Updates Completed into the DA Database within 72 Hours for Facility Based CLECs") and 111 ("Average Update Interval for DA Database for Facility Based CLECs") do not follow the July, August or September 2002 published metrics business rules.
<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
111	Obs.	338	4/9/2001	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate Ameritech's October 2001 reported results for Performance Measurement 111 ("Average Update Interval for DA Database for Facility Based CLECs").

Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported

111	Obs.	689	10/23/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements 110 ("Percentage of Updates Completed into the DA Database within 72 Hours for Facility Based CLECs") and 111 ("Average Update Interval for DA Database for Facility Based CLECs") for January, February and March 2002.
111	Obs.	780	1/14/2003	BearingPoint has been unable to replicate SBC Ameritech's July 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 110 ("Percentage of Updates Completed into the DA Database within 72 Hours for Facility Based CLECs") and 111 ("Average Update Interval for DA Database for Facility Based CLECs").
111	Obs.	785	1/16/2003	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measurements 110 ("Percentage of Updates Completed into the DA Database within 72 Hours for Facility Based CLECs") and 111 ("Average Update Interval for DA Database for Facility Based CLECs") do not follow the July, August or September 2002 published metrics business rules.

Coordinated Conversions

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
114	Obs.	509	6/10/2002	SBC Ameritech's documentation and calculations for the following Performance Measurements do not follow the January, February or March 2002 published metrics business rules: - 114 ("Percentage of Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)") - 115 ("Percentage of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers") - 115.1 ("Percent Provisioning Trouble Reports (PTR) (Rev. 2/20/02)") - 115.2 ("Mean Time To Restore. Provisioning Trouble Report (PTR)") - MI 3 ("Coordination Conversions Outside of Interval")
114	Obs.	570	7/15/2002	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measurements 114 ("Percentage of Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)") and 115 ("Percentage of Ameritech caused delayed Coordinated Cutovers") do not follow the January, February or March 2002 published metrics business rules.
114	Obs.	631	8/27/2002	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measurements 114 ("Percentage of Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)"), 115 ("Percentage of Ameritech caused delayed Coordinated Cutovers") and MI 3 ("Coordination Conversions Outside of Interval") do not follow the January, February or March 2002 published metrics business rules.

Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported

114	Obs.	722	12/3/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of PMs: 114 (“Percentage of Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)”) 115 (“Percentage of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers”) 115.1 (“Percent Provisioning Trouble Reports (PTR) (Rev. 2/20/02)”) 115.2 (“Mean Time To Restore. Provisioning Trouble Report (PTR)”) MI 3 (“Coordination Conversions Outside of Interval”) for July, August and September 2002
114	Obs.	791	1/23/2003	BearingPoint has been unable to replicate SBC Ameritech’s August 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement 115 (“Percentage of Ameritech Caused late Coordinated Cutovers in Excess of “X” (30, 60 and 120) minutes”).
114	Obs.	793	1/23/2003	SBC Ameritech’s posted results for Performance Measurements: 114 (“Percentage of Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)”) 114.1 (“CHC/FDT LNP with Loop Provisioning Interval”) 115 (“Percentage of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers”) 115.1 (“Mean Time to Restore – Provisioning Trouble Reports”) do not follow the August 2002 published metrics business rules.
114	Obs.	815	3/6/2003	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measurement 114 (“Percentage of Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)”) do not follow the published metrics business rules for July, August and September 2002.
114	Obs.	816	3/6/2003	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements: 114 (“Percentage of Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)”), 114.1 (“CHC/FDT LNP with Loop Provisioning Interval”), 115 (“Percentage of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers”), 115.1 (“Percent Provisioning Trouble Reports”), 115.2 (“Mean Time to Restore – Provisioning Trouble Reports”), and MI 3 (“Coordinated Conversions Outside of Interval”) for July, August and September 2002.

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
114.1	Obs.	793	1/23/2003	SBC Ameritech’s posted results for Performance Measurements: 114 (“Percentage of Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)”) 114.1 (“CHC/FDT LNP with Loop Provisioning Interval”) 115 (“Percentage of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers”) 115.1 (“Mean Time to Restore – Provisioning Trouble Reports”) do not follow the August 2002 published metrics business rules.

Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported

114.1	Obs.	816	3/6/2003	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements: 114 (“Percentage of Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)”), 114.1 (“CHC/FDT LNP with Loop Provisioning Interval”), 115 (“Percentage of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers”), 115.1 (“Percent Provisioning Trouble Reports”), 115.2 (“Mean Time to Restore – Provisioning Trouble Reports”), and MI 3 (“Coordinated Conversions Outside of Interval”) for July, August and September 2002.
-------	------	-----	----------	--

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
115	Obs.	509	6/10/2002	SBC Ameritech’s documentation and calculations for the following Performance Measurements do not follow the January, February or March 2002 published metrics business rules: - 114 (“Percentage of Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)”) - 115 (“Percentage of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers”) - 115.1 (“Percent Provisioning Trouble Reports (PTR) (Rev. 2/20/02)”) - 115.2 (“Mean Time To Restore. Provisioning Trouble Report (PTR)”) - MI 3 (“Coordination Conversions Outside of Interval”)
115	Obs.	570	7/15/2002	SBC Ameritech’s posted results for Performance Measurements 114 (“Percentage of Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)”) and 115 (“Percentage of Ameritech caused delayed Coordinated Cutovers”) do not follow the January, February or March 2002 published metrics business rules.
115	Obs.	631	8/27/2002	SBC Ameritech’s posted results for Performance Measurements 114 (“Percentage of Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)”), 115 (“Percentage of Ameritech caused delayed Coordinated Cutovers”) and MI 3 (“Coordination Conversions Outside of Interval”) do not follow the January, February or March 2002 published metrics business rules.
115	Obs.	677	10/9/2002	SBC Ameritech’s posted results for Performance Measurement 115 (“Percentage of Ameritech caused delayed Coordinated Cutovers”) do not follow the January, February or March 2002 published metrics business rules.
115	Obs.	722	12/3/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of PMs: 114 (“Percentage of Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)”) 115 (“Percentage of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers”) 115.1 (“Percent Provisioning Trouble Reports (PTR) (Rev. 2/20/02)”) 115.2 (“Mean Time To Restore. Provisioning Trouble Report (PTR)”) MI 3 (“Coordination Conversions Outside of Interval”) for July, August and September 2002

Attachment 10 to Rebuttal Affidavit of Timothy M. Connolly

<i>Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported</i>				
115	Obs.	793	1/23/2003	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measurements: 114 ("Percentage of Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)") 114.1 ("CHC/FDT LNP with Loop Provisioning Interval") 115 ("Percentage of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers") 115.1 ("Mean Time to Restore – Provisioning Trouble Reports") do not follow the August 2002 published metrics business rules.
115	Obs.	816	3/6/2003	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements: 114 ("Percentage of Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)"), 114.1 ("CHC/FDT LNP with Loop Provisioning Interval"), 115 ("Percentage of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers"), 115.1 ("Percent Provisioning Trouble Reports"), 115.2 ("Mean Time to Restore – Provisioning Trouble Reports"), and MI 3 ("Coordinated Conversions Outside of Interval") for July, August and September 2002.
<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
115.1	Obs.	509	6/10/2002	SBC Ameritech's documentation and calculations for the following Performance Measurements do not follow the January, February or March 2002 published metrics business rules: - 114 ("Percentage of Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)") - 115 ("Percentage of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers") - 115.1 ("Percent Provisioning Trouble Reports (PTR) (Rev. 2/20/02)") - 115.2 ("Mean Time To Restore. Provisioning Trouble Report (PTR)") - MI 3 ("Coordination Conversions Outside of Interval")
115.1	Obs.	531	6/17/2002	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measurements 115.1 ("Percent Provisioning Trouble Reports (PTR) (Rev. 2/20/02)") do not follow the January, February, or March 2002 published metrics business rules.
115.1	Obs.	722	12/3/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of PMs: 114 ("Percentage of Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)") 115 ("Percentage of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers") 115.1 ("Percent Provisioning Trouble Reports (PTR) (Rev. 2/20/02)") 115.2 ("Mean Time To Restore. Provisioning Trouble Report (PTR)") MI 3 ("Coordination Conversions Outside of Interval") for July, August and September 2002
115.1	Obs.	738	12/10/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 115.1 ("Mean Time to Restore – Provisioning Trouble Reports") for July, August and September 2002.

Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported

115.1	Obs.	777	12/31/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 115.1 ("Percent Provisioning Trouble Reports (PTR) (Rev. 2/20/02)") for the July, August and September 2002 data months.
115.1	Obs.	793	1/23/2003	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measurements: 114 ("Percentage of Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)") 114.1 ("CHC/FDT LNP with Loop Provisioning Interval") 115 ("Percentage of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers") 115.1 ("Mean Time to Restore – Provisioning Trouble Reports") do not follow the August 2002 published metrics business rules.
115.1	Obs.	816	3/6/2003	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements: 114 ("Percentage of Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)"), 114.1 ("CHC/FDT LNP with Loop Provisioning Interval"), 115 ("Percentage of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers"), 115.1 ("Percent Provisioning Trouble Reports"), 115.2 ("Mean Time to Restore – Provisioning Trouble Reports"), and MI 3 ("Coordinated Conversions Outside of Interval") for July, August and September 2002.

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
115.2	Obs.	509	6/10/2002	SBC Ameritech's documentation and calculations for the following Performance Measurements do not follow the January, February or March 2002 published metrics business rules: - 114 ("Percentage of Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)") - 115 ("Percentage of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers") - 115.1 ("Percent Provisioning Trouble Reports (PTR) (Rev. 2/20/02)") - 115.2 ("Mean Time To Restore. Provisioning Trouble Report (PTR)") - MI 3 ("Coordination Conversions Outside of Interval")
115.2	Obs.	709	11/27/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement 115.2 ("Percent Provisioning Trouble Reports") for July, August and September 2002.
115.2	Obs.	722	12/3/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of PMs: 114 ("Percentage of Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)") 115 ("Percentage of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers") 115.1 ("Percent Provisioning Trouble Reports (PTR) (Rev. 2/20/02)") 115.2 ("Mean Time To Restore. Provisioning Trouble Report (PTR)") MI 3 ("Coordination Conversions Outside of Interval") for July, August and September 2002

Attachment 10 to Rebuttal Affidavit of Timothy M. Connolly

Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported

115.2	Obs.	816	3/6/2003	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements: 114 (“Percentage of Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)”), 114.1 (“CHC/FDT LNP with Loop Provisioning Interval”), 115 (“Percentage of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers”), 115.1 (“Percent Provisioning Trouble Reports”), 115.2 (“Mean Time to Restore – Provisioning Trouble Reports”), and MI 3 (“Coordinated Conversions Outside of Interval”) for July, August and September 2002.
-------	------	-----	----------	--

Additional Measures

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
MI 2	Obs.	534	6/17/2002	SBC Ameritech’s posted results for Performance Measurements 10.4 (“Percentage of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices”) and MI 2 (“Percentage of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices Within 24 Hours of the Due Date”) do not follow the January and February 2002 published metrics business rules.
MI 2	Obs.	583	7/24/2002	SBC Ameritech’s posted results for Performance Measurement Performance Measurements 10.4 (“Percentage of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices”) and MI 2 (“Percentage of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices Within 24 Hours of the Due Date”) do not follow the January, February, and March 2002 published metrics business rules.
MI 2	Obs.	676	10/9/2002	SBC Ameritech’s posted results for Performance Measurement 10.4 (“Percentage of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices”) and MI 2 (“Percentage of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices Within 24 Hours of the Due Date”) do not follow the January, February or March 2002 published metrics business rules.
MI 2	Obs.	684	10/23/2002	SBC Ameritech’s posted results for Performance Measurements 10.4 (“Percentage of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices”) and Michigan 2 (“Percentage of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices within 24 Hours of the Due Date”) do not follow the January, February or March 2002 published metrics business rules.
MI 2	Obs.	725	12/3/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements 10.4 (“Percentage of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices”) and MI 2 (“Percentage of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices Within 24 Hours of the Due Date”) for July, August and September 2002.
<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
MI 3	Obs.	509	6/10/2002	SBC Ameritech’s documentation and calculations for the following Performance Measurements do not follow the January, February or March 2002 published metrics business

Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported

rules: - 114 (“Percentage of Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)”) - 115 (“Percentage of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers”) - 115.1 (“Percent Provisioning Trouble Reports (PTR) (Rev. 2/20/02)”) - 115.2 (“Mean Time To Restore. Provisioning Trouble Report (PTR)”) - MI 3 (“Coordination Conversions Outside of Interval”)

MI 3	Obs.	631	8/27/2002	SBC Ameritech’s posted results for Performance Measurements 114 (“Percentage of Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)”), 115 (“Percentage of Ameritech caused delayed Coordinated Cutovers”) and MI 3 (“Coordination Conversions Outside of Interval”) do not follow the January, February or March 2002 published metrics business rules.
MI 3	Obs.	722	12/3/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of PMs: 114 (“Percentage of Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)”) 115 (“Percentage of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers”) 115.1 (“Percent Provisioning Trouble Reports (PTR) (Rev. 2/20/02)”) 115.2 (“Mean Time To Restore. Provisioning Trouble Report (PTR)”) MI 3 (“Coordination Conversions Outside of Interval”) for July, August and September 2002
MI 3	Obs.	816	3/6/2003	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements: 114 (“Percentage of Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)”), 114.1 (“CHC/FDT LNP with Loop Provisioning Interval”), 115 (“Percentage of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers”), 115.1 (“Percent Provisioning Trouble Reports”), 115.2 (“Mean Time to Restore – Provisioning Trouble Reports”), and MI 3 (“Coordinated Conversions Outside of Interval”) for July, August and September 2002.

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
MI 5	Obs.	645	9/11/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate SBC Ameritech’s January 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement MI 5 (“Structure Requests Completed Outside of Interval”).
MI 5	Obs.	797	1/30/2003	BearingPoint has been unable to replicate SBC Ameritech’s August 2002 and September 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement MI 5 (“Structure Requests Completed Outside of Interval”).
<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
MI 9	Obs.	533	6/17/2002	SBC Ameritech’s posted results for Performance Measurements MI 9 (“Percentage Missing FOCs”) do not follow the January, February, and March 2002 published metrics business rules.

Attachment 10 to Rebuttal Affidavit of Timothy M. Connolly

Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported

MI 9	Obs.	661	9/23/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements 13.1(Total Order Process Percent Flow Through), 91(Percentage of LNP Only Due Dates within Industry Guidelines), 99 (“Average Delay Days for Ameritech Missed Due Dates”), MI9 (Percentage Missing FOCs), and MI13 (Percent Loss Notification Within One Hour of Service Order Completion) for January, February and March 2002.
------	------	-----	-----------	---

MI 9	Obs.	787	1/16/2003	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of 6 performance measures for July, August and September 2002.
------	------	-----	-----------	---

MI 9	Obs.	792	1/23/2003	SBC Ameritech’s posted results for Performance Measurement MI 9 (“Percentage Missing FOCs”) do not follow the July 2002 published metrics business rules.
------	------	-----	-----------	---

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
------------------	--	----------------------	---------------------	---------------------------------

MI 11	Obs.	594	8/7/2002	SBC Ameritech’s posted results for Performance Measurement MI 11 (“Average Interface Outage Notification”) do not follow the January, February or March 2002 published metrics business rules.
-------	------	-----	----------	--

MI 11	Obs.	611	8/21/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate SBC Ameritech’s January 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement MI 11 (“Average Interface Outage Notification”).
-------	------	-----	-----------	---

MI 11	Obs.	624	8/27/2002	SBC Ameritech’s posted results for Performance Measurement MI 11 (“Average Interface Outage Notification”) do not follow the January, February or March 2002 published metrics business rules.
-------	------	-----	-----------	--

MI 11	Obs.	690	10/30/2002	SBC Ameritech’s results for Performance Measurement Michigan 11 (“Average Interface Outage Notification”) are not posted correctly for January, February or March 2002.
-------	------	-----	------------	---

MI 11	Obs.	800	2/4/2003	BearingPoint has been unable to replicate SBC Ameritech’s July 2002, August 2002 and September 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement Michigan 11 (“Average Interface Outage Notification”).
-------	------	-----	----------	---

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
------------------	--	----------------------	---------------------	---------------------------------

MI 13	Obs.	438	5/2/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate Ameritech’s January 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement MI 13 (“Percent Loss Notification Within One Hour of Service Order Completion”).
-------	------	-----	----------	---

Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported

MI 13	Obs.	661	9/23/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements 13.1(Total Order Process Percent Flow Through), 91(Percentage of LNP Only Due Dates within Industry Guidelines), 99 (“Average Delay Days for Ameritech Missed Due Dates”), MI9 (Percentage Missing FOCs), and MI13 (Percent Loss Notification Within One Hour of Service Order Completion) for January, February and March 2002.
MI 13	Obs.	787	1/16/2003	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of 6 performance measures for July, August and September 2002.
<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
MI 14	Obs.	637	9/6/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement MI 14 (“Percent Completion Notifications Returned Within X Hours of Completion of Maintenance Trouble Ticket”).
MI 14	Obs.	642	9/11/2002	SBC Ameritech’s posted results for Performance Measurement MI 14 (“Percent Completion Notifications Returned Within X Hours of Completion of Maintenance Trouble Ticket”) do not follow the January, February or March 2002 published metrics business rules.
<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
MI 15	Obs.	247	3/11/2002	Ameritech’s posted results for certain performance measurements do not follow the published metrics business rules with regard to the reporting of results by state vs. reporting by company.
MI 15	Obs.	595	8/7/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement MI 15 (“Change Management”) for January 2002.
<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
MI 16	Obs.	247	3/11/2002	Ameritech’s posted results for certain performance measurements do not follow the published metrics business rules with regard to the reporting of results by state vs. reporting by company.
MI 16	Obs.	586	7/29/2002	SBC Ameritech’s results for Performance Measurements Michigan 10 (“Percent Time-out Transactions”) and Michigan 16 (“Percentage Rejected Query Notices”) are not posted correctly for January, February or March 2002.
MI 16	Obs.	686	10/23/2002	BearingPoint has been unable to replicate SBC Ameritech’s January 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement MI16 (“Percentage Rejected Query Notices”).

Attachment 10 to Rebuttal Affidavit of Timothy M. Connolly

Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
WI 2	Obs.	494	6/3/2002	Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measurements WI 1 ("Percent No – Access for UNE Loops – Provisioning") and WI 2 ("Percent No – Access for UNE Loops – Maintenance") do not follow the January 2002 published Metrics Business Rules for these measures.
WI 2	Obs.	740	12/12/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurement WI 2 ("Percent No-Access for UNE Loops – Maintenance") for the July, August and September 2002 data months.
<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
CLEC WI 1	Obs.	458	5/9/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate Ameritech's January 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement CLEC WI 1 ("Average Delay in Original FOCs Due Date Due to Delay Notices").
CLEC WI 1	Obs.	579	7/22/2002	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measurement CLEC WI 1 ("Average Delay in Original FOCs Due Dates Due to Delay Notices (Issue F)") do not follow the January, February or March 2002 published metrics business rules.
CLEC WI 1	Obs.	612	8/21/2002	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measurement CLEC WI 1 ("Average Delay in Original FOCs Due Dates Due to Delay Notices (Issue F)") do not follow the January, February or March 2002 published metrics business rules
CLEC WI 1	Obs.	813	2/27/2003	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measurement CLEC WI 1 ("Average Delay in Original FOCs Due Dates Due to Delay Notices (Issue F)") do not follow the July, August, or September 2002 published metrics business rules.
<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
CLEC WI 6	Obs.	121	10/23/2001	Ameritech applies exclusions to the calculations of performance measures CLEC WI 6 ("FMOD Process: Percent Form A Received Within the Interval Ordered by the Commission"), CLEC WI 7 ("FMOD Process: Percent Forms B, C, D, and E Received Within 72 Hours of Form A ") and CLEC WI 8 ("FMOD Process: Form B Percent Return FOC with New Due Date Within 24 Hours") that are not indicated in the metrics business rules.
CLEC WI 6	Obs.	368	4/18/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate Ameritech's October 2001 reported results for CLEC WI 6 ("Percent Form A Received w/in the Interval Ordered by the Commission").

Attachment 10 to Rebuttal Affidavit of Timothy M. Connolly

<i>Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported</i>			
CLEC WI 6 Obs.	536	6/19/2002	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measurements CLEC WI 6, CLEC WI 7, CLEC WI 8 and CLEC WI 9 do not follow the January, February, or March 2002 published metrics business rules.
CLEC WI 6 Obs.	718	12/3/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements CLEC WI 6 ("FMODE Process: Percent Form A Received Within the Interval Ordered by the Commission"), CLEC WI 7 ("FMODE Process: Percent Forms B, C, D, and E Received Within 72 Hours of Form A"), CLEC WI 8 ("FMODE Process: Forms B Percent Return FOC with New Due Date Within 24 Hours") and CLEC WI 9 ("FMODE Process: Form C Percent Return Quote Within the Interval Ordered by the Commission") for July, August and September 2002.
<i>PM</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
CLEC WI 7 Obs.	121	10/23/2001	Ameritech applies exclusions to the calculations of performance measures CLEC WI 6 ("FMODE Process: Percent Form A Received Within the Interval Ordered by the Commission"), CLEC WI 7 ("FMODE Process: Percent Forms B, C, D, and E Received Within 72 Hours of Form A ") and CLEC WI 8 ("FMODE Process: Form B Percent Return FOC with New Due Date Within 24 Hours") that are not indicated in the metrics business rules.
CLEC WI 7 Obs.	367	4/18/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate Ameritech's October 2001 reported results for Performance Measurement CLEC WI 7 ("Percent Form B, C, D, and E Received w/in 72 Hours of Form A").
CLEC WI 7 Obs.	536	6/19/2002	SBC Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measurements CLEC WI 6, CLEC WI 7, CLEC WI 8 and CLEC WI 9 do not follow the January, February, or March 2002 published metrics business rules.
CLEC WI 7 Obs.	554	6/27/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate SBC Ameritech's January 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement CLEC WI 7 (FMODE Process: Percent Forms B, C, D and E Received Within 72 Hours of Form A).
CLEC WI 7 Obs.	718	12/3/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements CLEC WI 6 ("FMODE Process: Percent Form A Received Within the Interval Ordered by the Commission"), CLEC WI 7 ("FMODE Process: Percent Forms B, C, D, and E Received Within 72 Hours of Form A"), CLEC WI 8 ("FMODE Process: Forms B Percent Return FOC with New Due Date Within 24 Hours") and CLEC WI 9 ("FMODE Process: Form C Percent Return Quote Within the Interval Ordered by the Commission") for July, August and September 2002.

Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported

<i>PM</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
CLEC WI 8 Obs.	121	10/23/2001	Ameritech applies exclusions to the calculations of performance measures CLEC WI 6 (“FMOD Process: Percent Form A Received Within the Interval Ordered by the Commission”), CLEC WI 7 (“FMOD Process: Percent Forms B, C, D, and E Received Within 72 Hours of Form A”) and CLEC WI 8 (“FMOD Process: Form B Percent Return FOC with New Due Date Within 24 Hours”) that are not indicated in the metrics business rules.
CLEC WI 8 Obs.	457	5/9/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate Ameritech’s January 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement CLEC WI 8 (“FMOD Process: Form B Percent Return FOC with New Due Date Within 24 Hours”).
CLEC WI 8 Obs.	536	6/19/2002	SBC Ameritech’s posted results for Performance Measurements CLEC WI 6, CLEC WI 7, CLEC WI 8 and CLEC WI 9 do not follow the January, February, or March 2002 published metrics business rules.
CLEC WI 8 Obs.	718	12/3/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements CLEC WI 6 (“FMOD Process: Percent Form A Received Within the Interval Ordered by the Commission”), CLEC WI 7 (“FMOD Process: Percent Forms B, C, D, and E Received Within 72 Hours of Form A”), CLEC WI 8 (“FMOD Process: Forms B Percent Return FOC with New Due Date Within 24 Hours”) and CLEC WI 9 (“FMOD Process: Form C Percent Return Quote Within the Interval Ordered by the Commission”) for July, August and September 2002.
<i>PM</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
CLEC WI 9 Obs.	536	6/19/2002	SBC Ameritech’s posted results for Performance Measurements CLEC WI 6, CLEC WI 7, CLEC WI 8 and CLEC WI 9 do not follow the January, February, or March 2002 published metrics business rules.
CLEC WI 9 Obs.	546	6/24/2002	SBC Ameritech’s posted results for Performance Measurement CLEC WI 9 (“FMOD Process: Form C Percent Return Quote Within the Interval Ordered by the Commission”) do not follow the January, February, or March 2002 published metrics business rules.

Illinois Performance Measures with Multiple BearingPoint PMR5 Failures Reported

CLEC WI 9 Obs.	718	12/3/2002	SBC Ameritech is improperly applying exclusions in the calculation of Performance Measurements CLEC WI 6 (“FMODE Process: Percent Form A Received Within the Interval Ordered by the Commission”), CLEC WI 7 (“FMODE Process: Percent Forms B, C, D, and E Received Within 72 Hours of Form A”), CLEC WI 8 (“FMODE Process: Forms B Percent Return FOC with New Due Date Within 24 Hours”) and CLEC WI 9 (“FMODE Process: Form C Percent Return Quote Within the Interval Ordered by the Commission”) for July, August and September 2002.
----------------	-----	-----------	--

CLEC WI 9 Obs.	733	12/3/2002	SBC Ameritech’s posted results for Performance Measurement CLEC WI 9 (“FMODE Process: Form C Percent Return Quote Within the Interval Ordered by the Commission”) do not follow the July, August, or September 2002 published metrics business rules.
----------------	-----	-----------	---

<i>PM</i>		<i>Number</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Issue Description</i>
IN 1	Obs.	279	3/27/2002	Ameritech’s calculation of Performance Measure IN 1 (“Percent Loop Acceptance Testing (LAT) Completed on or Prior to the Completion Date”) does not follow the published metrics business rules.
IN 1	Obs.	280	3/27/2002	KPMG Consulting is unable to replicate the Illinois October 2001 results for Performance Measure IN 1 (“Percent Loop Acceptance Testing (LAT) Completed on or Prior to the Completion Date”) as reported by Ameritech in its performance measurement results.
IN 1	Obs.	567	7/15/2002	KPMG Consulting has been unable to replicate SBC Ameritech’s January 2002 reported results for Performance Measurement IN 1 (“Percent Loop Acceptance Testing (LAT) Completed on the Due Date”).

PM Groups Affected by Failed Replication of PMs